

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**FILED**

JAN 23 2008

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

CLAUDIA GALINDO DE SEVILLA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 03-72549

Agency No. A78-249-486

MEMORANDUM\*

CLAUDIA GALINDO DE SEVILLA,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney  
General,

Respondent.

No. 05-74754

Agency No. A78-249-486

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Argued and Submitted January 10, 2008

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

Seattle, Washington

Before: BEEZER, KLEINFELD, and TALLMAN, Circuit Judges.

Claudia Galindo De Sevilla appeals a United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement decision to reinstate her prior removal order.

We do not have jurisdiction to review Galindo's appeal of her April 2000 expedited order of removal.<sup>1</sup>

The reinstatement order did not violate Galindo's due process rights. In Morales-Izquierdo v. Gonzales,<sup>2</sup> we held that "[r]einstatement of a prior removal order — regardless of the process afforded in the underlying order — does not offend due process because reinstatement of a prior order does not change the alien's rights or remedies."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Morales-Izquierdo v. Gonzales, 486 F.3d 484, 496 (9th Cir. 2007) (en banc); Avendano-Ramirez v. Ashcroft, 365 F.3d 813, 818-19 (9th Cir. 2004); Alvarenga Villalobos v. INS, 271 F.3d 1169, 1170 (9th Cir. 2001).

<sup>2</sup> Morales-Izquierdo, 486 F.3d at 496.

<sup>3</sup> See id. at 497.

Galindo's claim that her removal order was invalid is DISMISSED for lack of jurisdiction and her petition for review of the reinstatement order is DENIED.